29th October 1936, at 12 of the clock, *Rajamantrapravina* S. P. Rajagopalachari, First Member of Council, in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Lower Candle-Power Bulbs for Village Panchayets.

Q.—19. **Mr. M. RAME GOWDA** (Chintamani Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) what is the candle-power of bulbs used for electric street lights in villages in the State in the several village panchayets ;

(*b*) what is the amount realised annually by Government for each of these lights ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Diwan Bahadur N. N. Ayyangar).**—

(*a*) The street lights in villages are of 20, 40 and 60 watts corresponding to 16, 36 and 54 candle-power, respectively.

(*b*) The rate of royalty charged is Rs. 15, 18 and 22-8-0 per annum for 20, 40 and 60 watts, respectively.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—What is the candle-power of bulbs used in village panchayets and that used in municipalities ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—There are no restrictions as regards the candle-power of bulbs to be used in village panchayets, but municipalities have to instal 60-watt bulbs.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—Will village panchayets be supplied with 40-watt bulbs instead of 60-watt bulbs ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—The matter will be considered if the village panchayets represent to that effect.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—If Rs. 22-8-0 is the royalty for 54 candle-power what will it be for one candle-power ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—That is not how the royalty is calculated.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—For 60 watts the royalty is Rs. 22-8-0 per annum. For 40 watts, the royalty should be Rs. 15 per annum on the same basis. By charging Rs. 18 per annum, as stated in the answer, are not the Government charging more ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—No. Working expenses have got to be taken into consideration. The net revenue is only about Rs. 4, 7 and 11 from 20, 40 and 60-watt lamps, respectively, which is roughly in proportion to the illumination.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—Is it not possible to supply 40-watt bulbs to municipalities instead of 60-watt bulbs as at present ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—Not possible.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—Why is it not possible ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Even now the municipalities are being charged at a low rate. The standard candle-power for municipalities is 54 corresponding to 60-watts and if 40-watt bulbs are provided the rate charged will have to be still lower.

The CHIEF ELECTRICAL ENGINEER (Mr. F. N. Mowdawalla).—At present the department has provided 20, 40 and 60 watts for a royalty of Rs. 15, 18 and 22-8-0, respectively. In other words, for Rs 15 a year, a panchayet gets 20-watt bulbs all the year round. By paying only Rs. 3 more, it will get double the illumination, so that from the point of view of the raiyats it is better to have higher illumination at a slightly increased cost. Similarly in the case of 60-watt lamps, 50 per cent more illumination can be obtained on payment of 25 per cent more. As a matter of fact, even at the rate of Rs. 18 for 40 watts, the department earns only half an anna per unit. The bulk of the cost is due to interest, depreciation on the works, etc.

Mr. M. SUBBAIYA.—But, since the municipalities are not in a position to pay the higher royalty of Rs. 22-8-0 per annum, why not the department give them 40-watt bulbs ?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—It is not possible to supply 40-watt bulbs to major municipalities as the revenue will not be adequate.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—These are all technical matters. Even at present, the department earns only about half an anna per unit. Supplying 40-watt

bulbs at a royalty of Rs. 18 to major municipalities would benefit neither the department nor the municipality concerned. Instead of paying Rs 18, if the municipalities paid only Rs. 4½ more they would be having 50 per cent more illumination.

Mr. Anekal SRINIVASIENGAR.—Is it not stated in the guarantee that the royalty to be paid is Rs. 22-8-0 for either 60 watts or 40 watts ?

Mr. F. N. MOWDAWALLA.—What that really amounts to is that 60-watt lamps are provided for Rs. 22-8-0. The terms of the guarantee will be modified by omitting 40 watts.

Sri Narasimhaswami Temple at Rajitadripura.

Q.—21. Messrs. C. PATTABHIRAMA SETTY (Chiknaikanhalli Municipality) and G. KANCHAPPA (Chiknaikanhalli Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how much money is available at the credit of the temple of Sri Narasimhaswami at Rajitadripura (Hatyal) situated within the limits of Chiknaikanhalli and Tiptur taluks ;

(*b*) how is this amount invested in the treasury ;

(*c*) what is the amount of annual income ;

(*d*) what is the expenditure ;

(*e*) what was the amount of annual grant sanctioned (previously) ;

(*f*) what is it now ;

(*g*) are Government aware of the fact that devotees are coming to the temple both at the time of *jatra* and at other times ?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar).—

(*a*) and (*b*) Rs. 1,109-11-6 in cash and Rs. 1,000 in 5 Per Cent Loan.

(*c*) Rs. 503-6-9 as per sanctioned scale.

(*d*) Rs. 413, leaving a reserve of Rs. 90.

(*e*) and (*f*) Rs. 11 a year.

(*g*) Yes.

Mr. G. KANCHAPPA.—Is it a major or minor institution? And are there *dharmadarsis* to the temple ?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. H. C. Mummadi VEERABHADRAPPA.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that the temple is in a state of utter disrepair ?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No.

Mr. H. C. Mummadi VEERABHADRAPPA.—Were not representations made for the early repair of this temple as many pilgrims have been visiting it ?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—I do not know.

Mr. H. C. Mummadi VEERABHADRAPPA.—Now that a request has been made, will the Government be pleased to effect repairs to the temple ?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—That will be considered.

Mr. H. C. Mummadi VEERABHADRAPPA.—Is not the annual grant of Rs. 11 sanctioned to this institution too small an amount ?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—That is a matter of opinion. Some institutions get even smaller amounts.

Mr. H. C. Mummadi VEERABHADRAPPA.—Will the Government be pleased to increase the grant ?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—The matter may be represented to Government separately.

Assessment below Huliyar Amanikere Tank.

Q.—22. Mr. H. C. Mummadi VEERABHADRAPPA (Chiknaikanhalli Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) when was it that the Huliyar Amanikere tank discharged and the lands thereunder cultivated with wet crops ;

(*b*) what was the extent of land irrigated by this tank ;

(*c*) have the raiyats given any petitions applying for *nirsardi* and, if so, how many applications were received ;

(*d*) what was the amount of wet assessment recovered from the raiyats and what was the rate at which the assessment was levied ;